arXiv:1610.06336v1 [math.FA] 20 Oct 2016

The KLS Isoperimetric Conjecture for Generalized Orlicz Balls

Alexander V. Kolesnikov[1] and Emanuel Milman[2]

Abstract

What is the optimal way to cut a convex bounded domain K in Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ into two halves of equal volume, so that the interface between the two halves has least surface area? A conjecture of Kannan, Lovász and Simonovits asserts that, if one does not mind gaining a universal numerical factor (independent of n) in the surface area, one might as well dissect K using a hyperplane. This conjectured essential equivalence between the former non-linear isoperimetric inequality and its latter linear relaxation, has been shown over the last two decades to be of fundamental importance to the understanding of volumetric and spectral properties of convex domains. In this work, we address the conjecture for the subclass of generalized Orlicz balls

$$K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i) \leq E\},$$

confirming its validity for certain levels $E \in \mathbb{R}$ under a mild technical assumption on the growth of the convex functions V_i at infinity (without which we confirm the conjecture up to a $\log(1+n)$ factor). In sharp contrast to previous approaches for tackling the KLS conjecture, we emphasize that no symmetry is required from K. This significantly enlarges the subclass of convex bodies for which the conjecture is confirmed.

1 Introduction

1.1 A Conjecture of Kannan–Lovász–Simonovits

Given a separable metric space (X, d) endowed with a Borel probability measure μ, Minkowski's (exterior) boundary measure of a Borel set $A \subset X$, denoted $\mu^+(A)$, is

[1]Faculty of Mathematics, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. Supported by RFBR project 14-01-00237 and the DFG project RO 1195/12-1. E-mail: Sascha77@mail.ru.

[2]Department of Mathematics, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel. The research leading to these results is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 637851). Email: emilman@tx.technion.ac.il.

defined as $\mu^+(A) := \liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\mu(A^d_\epsilon) - \mu(A)}{\epsilon}$, where $A^d_\epsilon := \{x \in X; \exists y \in A \;\; d(x,y) < \epsilon\}$ denotes the ϵ-neighborhood of A in (X,d). The Cheeger constant is then defined as:

$$D_{\mathrm{Che}}(X,d,\mu) := \inf_{A \subset X} \frac{\mu^+(A)}{\min(\mu(A), 1-\mu(A))} \;, \tag{1.1}$$

measuring a certain isoperimetric property of the space (X,d,μ). In this work, we restrict our scope to the Euclidean setting $(X,d) = (\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$, and simply write $D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) = D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|, \mu)$. In the latter linear setting, we can also introduce the following *linear relaxation* of the Cheeger constant, defined as:

$$D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) := \inf_{\substack{H \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ H \text{ is a halfspace}}} \frac{\mu^+(H)}{\min(\mu(H), 1-\mu(H))}.$$

Note that when A has smooth boundary and μ is supported on a set Ω having Lipschitz boundary and has continuous density Ψ in Ω, then $\mu^+(A) = \int_{\partial A \cap \mathrm{int}(\Omega)} \Psi(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x)$, where $\mathcal{H}^k$ denotes the k-dimensional Hausdorff measure.

Clearly $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) \geq D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu)$, and in general it is not hard to see that this inequality cannot be reversed in any weak sense, as the right-hand-side may be zero. However, when $\mu = \lambda_K$, where λ_K denotes the uniform (Lebesgue) probability measure on $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, a convex compact set with non-empty interior ("convex body"), Kannan, Lovász and Simonovits (KLS) conjectured in [33] (using an equivalent formulation) that:

$$D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\lambda_K) \geq c D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Che}}(\lambda_K), \tag{1.2}$$

for some universal numeric constant $c > 0$, independent of any other parameters such as n or K. We reserve in this work the use of $c, C, C_1, C_2, c', C', C''$ etc... to denote such positive universal numeric constants.

Recall that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called log-concave if $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ with $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ convex; in particular, $\mu = \lambda_K$ is log-concave. The class of log-concave probability measures on affine subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^N$ for all $N \geq 1$ is the smallest class containing λ_K for all convex bodies $K \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ (for all $N \geq 1$) which is in addition closed under taking marginals and weak limits (see e.g. [1]). It is not hard to see that a positive answer to the KLS conjecture would also lead to a positive answer to the analogous question for the entire class of log-concave probability measures, so it is also interesting to study the conjecture in this extended generality.

Remark. It is known that for a log-concave measure μ, the infimum in (1.1) is attained for a Borel set A of measure $1/2$ (see Sternberg–Zumbrun [60] for λ_K, Bobkov

[8] for the one-dimensional case and [48] in general), and the same applies to its linear relaxation:

$$D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) = 2 \inf_{A \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \left\{ \mu^+(A) \; ; \; \mu(A) = 1/2 \right\} \; ,$$
$$D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) = 2 \inf_{\substack{H \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ H \text{ is a halfspace}}} \left\{ \mu^+(H) \; ; \; \mu(H) = 1/2 \right\} .$$

So the KLS conjecture ultimately pertains to the isoperimetric behaviour of sets having measure 1/2.

The KLS conjectured essential equivalence between the former non-linear isoperimetric inequality and its latter linear relaxation, has been shown over the last two decades to be of fundamental importance to the understanding of volumetric and spectral properties of convex domains, revealing numerous connections to other central conjectures on the concentration of volume in convex bodies (see e.g. [46, 13, 23, 44, 4, 22, 21] or the monograph [1] for a nice overview). Let us only mention here the following equivalent formulation of the KLS conjecture, which has a clear analytic interpretation.

Denote by $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)$ the Poincaré constant of μ, namely the best possible constant in the following Poincaré inequality:

$$\| f - \int f d\mu \|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \, \| |\nabla f| \|_{L^2(\mu)} \quad \text{for all Lipschitz } f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.3}$$

When $\mu = \lambda_K$, $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_K) = 1/\sqrt{\lambda_1(K)}$ where $\lambda_1(K)$ denotes the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Neumann Laplacian on K (a similar interpretation holds for a general μ using an appropriate weighted Laplacian). We denote by $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)$ the linear relaxation obtained by only testing (1.3) on linear functionals $f(x) = \langle x, \theta \rangle$; clearly $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \leq D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)$. It is known by results of Maz'ya [47], Cheeger [20], Buser [18] and Ledoux [46], that for all log-concave probability measures μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\frac{1}{2} D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu) \leq \frac{1}{D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)} \leq C \; D_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu),$$

for some universal constant $C > 1/2$; the same inequality also holds for the corresponding linear relaxations $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Che}}(\mu)$ and $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)$. Consequently, the KLS conjecture may be equivalently reformulated as asserting that:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \leq C \; D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu), \tag{1.4}$$

for some universal constant $C > 1$ and all log-concave measures μ. In other words, the KLS conjecture asserts that for log-concave measures (and in particular, on convex bodies), the Poincaré inequality (1.3) should be *essentially* saturated by linear functionals.

1.2 Previously Known Results

More than two decades after being put forth, the KLS conjecture is still unresolved, and the presently best known (dimension-dependent) estimate on $C = C_n$ in (1.4) is obtained by combining a remarkable reduction by R. Eldan [21] and the thin-shell estimates of Guédon–Milman [31], yielding $C_n = Cn^{1/3}\sqrt{\log(1+n)}$, with previous contributions by S. Bobkov [9], B. Klartag [36, 37] and B. Fleury [24]. The conjecture has been confirmed (uniformly in n) for unit-balls of ℓ_p^n (by S. Sodin [59] when $p \in [1, 2]$ and R. Latała and J. Wojtaszczyk [44] when $p \in [2, \infty]$), the simplex by F. Barthe and P. Wolff [7], convex bodies of revolution by N. Huet [32], convex sets of bounded volume-ratio constructed in a certain manner from log-concave measures which satisfy the conjecture [42], linear images and Cartesian products of these subclasses (see Bobkov–Houdré [12] for the latter) and various perturbations thereof [48, 51]. For the interesting class of unconditional convex bodies (invariant under reflections with respect to the coordinate hyperplanes), the best known estimate $C_n = C \log(1+n)$ was established by B. Klartag [39]. In addition, the conjecture has been established in a certain weak sense for random Gaussian polytopes (with high-probability) by B. Fleury [25].

Besides these subclasses of convex bodies and their natural extensions to the log-concave setting, the extended KLS conjecture has also been confirmed for rotation invariant log-concave measures by S. Bobkov [11] (see also [32] for generalizations), for log-concave measures with strictly convex potentials V by Bakry–Émery [3], for certain Gibbs measures corresponding to conservative spin systems by Barthe–Wolff [7] and Barthe–Milman [6], for certain log-concave measures supported in a cube by Klartag [40], and for unconditional measures with strictly positive derivatives in the principle directions by the authors in [43]. In addition, Klartag's $C_n = C \log(1+n)$ estimate for unconditional log-concave measures has been generalized to log-concave measures enjoying more general symmetries by Barthe and D. Cordero–Erausquin [5]. To the best of our knowledge, this is essentially a complete list.

1.3 Generalized Orlicz Balls

The above results typically make heavy use of the symmetries possessed by K or μ. In this work, we address the KLS conjecture for a certain family of convex bodies which may be called *generalized Orlicz balls*. Contrary to the standard definition of these bodies in the literature (see e.g. [1]), we emphasize that our definition does not impose any symmetry conditions on these bodies.

Definition. *A convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a generalized Orlicz ball if there exist n one-dimensional convex functions $V_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$ so that:*

$$K = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i) \leq E \right\}.$$

The traditional definition also requires that V_i be even functions which vanish at the origin, so that the resulting class is always unconditional - we will call such bodies *unconditional generalized Orlicz balls*. In that case, K is the unit-ball of the generalized Orlicz norm:

$$\|x\|_K := \inf \left\{ t > 0 \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i/t) \leq E \right\}; \tag{1.5}$$

indeed, the convexity of V_i ensures the validity of the triangle inequality, and the symmetry of V_i ensures that $\|-x\|_K = \|x\|_K$, so that this defines a norm (with an unconditional basis). By abuse of notation, we will still refer to (1.5) as a norm as soon as K contains the origin in its interior, even without any symmetry assumptions on V_i. As shown by Wojtaszczyk [63], contrary to general unconditional convex bodies, unconditional generalized Orlicz balls enjoy the following negative correlation property (first noted by Anttila–Ball–Perissinaki [2] for unit-balls of ℓ_p^n):

$$\mathbb{E} X_i^2 X_j^2 \leq \mathbb{E} X_i^2 \mathbb{E} X_j^2 \quad \forall i \neq j, \tag{1.6}$$

where X is a random-vector uniformly distributed in K. Naturally, this property heavily relies on the underlying symmetry, and is very helpful in establishing various concentration properties for this class; for instance, using an extension of (1.6) due to Pilipczuk–Wojtaszczyk [56], Fleury [23] showed that for unconditional generalized Orlicz balls, $|X|$ is optimally concentrated around its mean. However, to the best of our knowledge, even for this subclass of unconditional bodies, the best estimate on $C = C_n$ in the KLS conjecture (1.4) is the general one for unconditional bodies $C_n = C \log(1+n)$ due to Klartag [39].

1.4 Simplified Main Results

In this work, we *do not* impose any symmetry assumptions on V_i, and in particular *do not* (and cannot) employ (1.6) at all. We formulate our main results in full generality in the next section, but for now we only state the following simplified version:

Theorem 1.1 (Simplified Main Theorem)**.** *For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, let $V_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, denote a convex function normalized so that $\min V_i = 0$ and so that*

$\mu_i := \exp(-V_i(y))dy$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with barycenter at the origin. Given $E > 0$, denote:

$$K_E := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i) \leq E \right\}.$$

Then there exists $E \leq n$ so that:

$$1/C \leq \mathrm{Vol}(K_E)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq C, \tag{1.7}$$

and:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C \log(e + A_2 \wedge n) D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}). \tag{1.8}$$

Here $C > 1$ is a universal constant, and $A_2 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_2$ where:

$$\alpha_i := \inf \left\{ t > 0 \; ; \; \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{1}{t}|V_i'(y)y - 1|} d\mu_i(y) \leq e \right\} \in (0, \infty]. \tag{1.9}$$

In particular, we confirm the KLS conjecture for the generalized Orlicz ball K_E as soon as A_2 is bounded above by a constant, reflecting a certain upper bound on the rate of growth of $\{V_i\}$ at infinity. The volume estimate (1.7) is a natural normalization and prevents various trivial statements (like the one obtained by taking $E \to 0$); moreover, the precise result we obtain in Section 2 provides an explicit description of the levels E to which the above result applies. This provides an explicitly computable criterion for the validity of the KLS conjecture, and significantly extends the class of convex bodies for which the conjecture is confirmed.

Note that the dependence on A_2 in (1.8) is logarithmic, and that in the worst case, regardless of the value of A_2 (which may be infinite), the estimate (1.8) confirms the KLS conjecture for K_E up to a factor of $\log(1 + n)$, matching Klartag's estimate for unconditional convex bodies, but without assuming any symmetry. In fact, the above $\log(1 + n)$ factor is a consequence of a more general result, stating that one may always find a level set of a general log-concave measure μ having essentially the same spectral-gap, up to this factor:

Theorem 1.2 (From log-concave measure to good level-set)**.** *Let $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ denote a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\min V = 0$. Then there exists $E \leq n$ so that $K_E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; V(x) \leq E\}$ satisfies (1.7) and:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \log(e + \sqrt{n} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)).$$

To illustrate how these results (and their extensions) may be applied, we provide a couple of simple examples in this introductory section. We denote by $a_+ := (|a| + a)/2$ and $a_- := (|a| - a)/2$ the positive and negative parts of $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Example 1.3. Let $p_i^{\pm} \in [1, P]$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, for a fixed arbitrary constant $P \geq 1$. Then there exists $E \leq n$ so that the generalized Orlicz ball:

$$K_E := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n \left((x_i)_+^{p_i^+} + (x_i)_-^{p_i^-} \right) \leq E \right\},$$

satisfies (1.7) and:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C \log(e + P \wedge n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E}),$$

for some universal $C > 0$. Moreover, if $p_i^{\pm} \in [2, P]$, then:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C' \sqrt{\log(e + P \wedge n)} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E}).$$

Of course, one may replace the function y^p in this example with other non-homogeneous variations like $y^p \log(1 + y)$, etc...

Example 1.4. Let $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ denote a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\min V = 0$ and $\mathrm{Hess} V \geq \rho^2 \mathrm{Id}$ with $\rho > 0$. Then there exists $E \leq n$ so that $K_E = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; V(x) \leq E\}$ satisfies (1.7) and:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq \frac{C}{\rho} \log(e + \sqrt{n}/\rho).$$

1.5 Method of Proof

Our is based on transferring concentration information from the log-concave measure $\mu := \exp(-V(x))dx$ onto the uniform measure λ_{K_E} on its level set K_E. We achieve this in three separate steps. The most important step is to transfer concentration from μ to an auxiliary measure $\mu_{K_E,w}$, which is a linearized version of μ supported on an annulus around K_E of relative width $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}$. We then pass from $\mu_{K_E,w}$ to the cone measure $\sigma_{\partial K_E}$ supported on ∂K_E, from which we finally pass to λ_{K_E} and optimize on $w_0 > 0$. Finally, an isoperimetric (or Poincaré) inequality is deduced using the convexity of K_E and the known equivalence between concentration and isoperimetry under convexity assumptions. Surprisingly, these three different steps require three different methods for transferring concentration: an $L^p(\mu)$ estimate on $d\mu_{K_E,w}/d\mu$, a Wasserstein-distance estimate on $W_1(\mu_{K_E,w}, \sigma_{\partial K_E})$, and a Hardy-type inequality with-boundary for λ_{K_E}. The only place where we need to assume that μ is a product measure (i.e. that $V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i)$ and hence K_E is a generalized Orlicz ball) is in the first step, resulting in an estimate depending only on A_2 and not the dimension; this allows for future possible generalizations. To get the dimension-dependent $\log(1 + n)$ estimate, no assumption on μ is needed beyond log-concavity, and we can simply use L^∞ estimate in the first step.

The rest of this work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate our various general main results in this work, of which Theorem 1.1 is a particular case. In Section 3 we obtain the $L^p(\mu)$ estimate on $d\mu_{K_E,w}/d\mu$, modulo an estimate on $\mathrm{Vol}(K_E)$ which is obtained in Section 4. In Section 5 we obtain the Wasserstein distance estimate and the Hardy-type inequality. In Section 6 we put everything together and prove our main results.

2 Statement of Results

Theorem 2.1 (Main Technical Theorem)**.** *Let $V_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, denote a sequence of convex functions normalized so that $\mu_i := \exp(-V_i(y))dy$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Denote $V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i)$ and $m_i := \min V_i$, and assume that $\sum_{i=1}^n m_i = 0$ so that $\min V = 0$. Assume in addition that the following scale-invariant quantities are finite:*

$$\forall i = 1, \ldots, n \quad \alpha_i := \inf \left\{ t > 0 \; ; \; \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{1}{t}\left|V_i'(y)y - 1\right|} d\mu_i(y) \leq e \right\} < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Set $A_2 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n \right\|_2$ and $M = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} e^{m_i}$. Given $E > E_0 := V(0)$, define the following convex body on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (containing the origin in its interior):

$$K_E := \{V \leq E\} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i) \leq E \right\},$$

the unit-ball of the generalized Orlicz norm $\|x\|_{K_E} := \inf \{t > 0 \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i/t) \leq E\}$. Consider the set:

$$\mathit{Level}(V) := \left\{ E \geq 0 \; ; \; e^{-E}\mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \geq \frac{1}{e}\frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} \right\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Then for all $E \in \mathit{Level}(V) \cap (E_0, \infty)$:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C \left(M \log(e + A_2 M) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x) \right),$$

for an appropriate universal numeric constant $C > 1$.

Since $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E})$ remains invariant under translation of K_E, by translating $V \mapsto V(\cdot + b)$ (i.e. $V_i \mapsto V_i(\cdot + b_i)$ for $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$), we immediately obtain:

Corollary 2.2. *With the same notation and assumptions as in Theorem 2.1, given* $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *denote* $A_2(b) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| (\alpha_i(b))_{i=1}^n \right\|_2$*, where:*

$$\alpha_i(b) := \inf \left\{ t > 0 \; ; \; \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\frac{1}{t} \left| V_i'(y)(y-b_i) - 1 \right|} d\mu_i(y) \leq e \right\}.$$

Then for all $E \in \mathrm{Level}(V)$ *and* $b \in \mathrm{int}(K_E)$*:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C \left(M \log(e + A_2(b) M) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x - b| \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x) \right).$$

There is a particular value of $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ which is the most natural to use above – the barycenter of $\mu := \exp(-V(x))dx$, denoted:

$$b_\mu := \int x \, d\mu(x) = \left(\int x_i d\mu_i(x_i) \right)_{i=1}^n .$$

With this choice, it is immediate to verify that $\{\alpha_i(b_\mu)\}$ are both scale and translation invariant in μ. Let $b_E := \int x \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x)$ denote the barycenter of K_E, and let:

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu := \mathbb{E}((X_\mu - b_\mu) \otimes (X_\mu - b_\mu)) \; , \; \mathrm{Cov}_E := \mathbb{E}((X_E - b_E) \otimes (X_E - b_E)),$$

denote the corresponding covariance matrices, where X_μ and X_E are distributed according to μ and λ_{K_E}, respectively. To provide some more relevant information regarding the subset $\mathrm{Level}(V)$ of good levels E and the associated level sets K_E, to which the above results apply, we have the following:

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ *denote a log-concave probability measure on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *so that* $\min V = 0$*. For* $E \geq 0$ *let* $K_E := \{V \leq E\}$*, and let Level*(V) *be defined by (2.2). Let* $b_\mu, b_E, Cov_\mu, Cov_E$ *be defined as above. There exist numeric constants* $c, C, C' > 0$ *so that:*

(1) Level(V) *is a non-empty closed interval* $[E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$*.*

(2) $E_{\min} \leq n$*.*

(3) $1 \leq E_{\max} - E_{\min} \leq e \frac{n! e^n}{n^n} = e\sqrt{2\pi n}(1 + o(1))$ *as* $n \to \infty$*.*

(4) $1 + o(1) \leq \mathrm{Vol}(K_{E_{\min}})^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \mathrm{Vol}(K_{E_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq e(1 + o(1))$ *as* $n \to \infty$*.*

(5) In particular, $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \geq c > 0$ *for all* $E \geq E_{\min}$*.*

(6) $b_\mu \in K_{(E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n}$*.*

(7) $|b_E - b_\mu| \leq C \log(1 + n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\mu)$*, for all* $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$*.*

(8) $Cov_E \leq C' \log^2(1+n) Cov_\mu$ *as positive-definite matrices, for all* $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$.

We remark that assertion (6) above is a refinement of a result of M. Fradelizi [26], who showed that under the above assumptions $V(b_\mu) \leq n$, i.e. that $b_\mu \in K_n$ – see Remark 4.7 for further discussion. Combining Corollary 2.2 with Proposition 2.3, we can easily obtain:

Theorem 2.4 (Main Theorem)**.** *For all* $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$ *and* $b \in int(K_E)$*:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C_1 \left(M \log(e + A_2(b) M) + \frac{|b - b_E|}{\sqrt{n}} + D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \right).$$

In particular, setting $b = b_\mu$*:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C_2 M \log(e + A_2(b_\mu) M) D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \quad \forall E \in [(E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n, E_{\max}].$$

Theorem 2.4 confirms the KLS conjecture for K_E as above whenever $A_2(b_\mu), M \leq C$. By simultaneously rescaling all functions V_i, we can also easily remove the assumption that $\int \exp(-V_i(y)) dy = 1$.

Corollary 2.5 (Main Theorem - Generalized Version)**.** *Let* $\tilde{W}_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, *denote a sequence of non-constant convex functions normalized so that* $\min \tilde{W}_i = 0$. *Let* $z_i := \int \exp(-\tilde{W}_i(y)) dy$ *and set* $\tilde{V}_i = \tilde{W}_i + \log z_i$ *and* $\tilde{V}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{V}_i(x_i)$. *Given* $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *denote:*

$$\alpha_i(\tilde{V}, \tilde{b}) := \inf \left\{ t > 0 \; ; \; \int e^{\frac{1}{t} |\tilde{V}_i'(y)(y - \tilde{b}_i) - 1|} e^{-\tilde{V}_i(y)} dy \leq e \right\},$$

and set $A_2(\tilde{b}) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \| (\alpha_i(\tilde{V}, \tilde{b}))_{i=1}^n \|_2$. *Denote* $z := (\Pi_{i=1}^n z_i)^{1/n}$, $M = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} \frac{z_i}{z}$. *Set* $\tilde{W}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i(x_i)$ *and* $V(x) = \tilde{W}(zx)$. *Given* $E > 0$, *consider the convex sets:*

$$\tilde{K}_E := \{W \leq E\} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i(x_i) \leq E \right\} \; , \; K_E := \{V \leq E\} = \frac{1}{z} \tilde{K}_E.$$

Denote as usual:

$$\mathit{Level}(V) := \left\{ E \geq 0 \; ; \; e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \geq \frac{1}{e} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} \right\},$$

Then all of the assertions of Proposition 2.3 apply to $\mathit{Level}(V)$*, and we have for all* $E \in \mathit{Level}(V)$ *and* $\tilde{b} \in int(\tilde{K}_E)$*:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \leq C_1 \left(z M \log(e + A_2(\tilde{b}) M) + \frac{|\tilde{b} - \tilde{b}_E|}{\sqrt{n}} + D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \right),$$

where $\tilde{b}_E := \int x \, d\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}$. *In particular, setting* $\tilde{b} = \tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}} := \int x \exp(-\tilde{V}(x))dx$*:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \leq C' M \log(e + A_2(\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}})M) D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \quad \forall E \in [(E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n, E_{\max}].$$

Finally, we state our $\log(1+n)$ estimate on the relation between the Poincaré constants of a general log-concave measure μ and its level-sets.

Theorem 2.6 (From log-concave measure to good level-sets)**.** *Let* $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ *denote a log-concave probability measure on* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *with* $\min V = 0$*. Denote its level sets by* $K_E := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \, ; \, V(x) \leq E\}$*, and define as usual Level*(V) *by (2.2). Then for all* $E \in$ *Level*(V) *we have:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \leq C D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \log(e + \sqrt{n} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)).$$

Remark 2.7. An inspection of the proof of Theorem 2.6 (and the relevant parts of Proposition 2.3) reveals that we could actually omit the $\sqrt{n}$ above, obtaining a dimension-independent estimate, for any $E \geq 0$ so that:

$$e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \geq c > 0, \tag{2.3}$$

for some universal constant $c > 0$. Unfortunately, such exceptionally good levels E do not necessarily exist, and the best one can ensure in general is:

$$\exists E \geq 0 \quad e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \geq \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}}(1 + o(1)),$$

corresponding to the case $V(x) = \|x - x_0\|$ for some norm $\|\cdot\|$ (whose unit-ball has appropriate volume) and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which results in the above $\sqrt{n}$ factor. As we did not find a reasonable condition for ensuring (2.3), we only mention this variant in passing.

3 Transferring Concentration: From Product Measure to Linearized One on Annulus

Given a metric space (X, d) and a Borel probability measure ν, the associated concentration profile $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(X, d, \nu) : \mathbb{R}_+ \to [0, 1/2]$ is defined by:

$$\mathcal{K}(r) := \sup \left\{ \nu(X \setminus A^d_r) \, ; \, \mu(A) \geq 1/2 \right\} \, , \, A^d_r := \{x \in X \, ; \, d(x, A) < r\} \, .$$

Equivalently, it is well-known and immediate to verify that:

$$\mathcal{K}(r) = \sup \left\{ \nu \left\{ f \geq \mathrm{med}_\mu f + r \right\} \, ; \, f : (X, d) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is 1-Lipschitz } \right\};$$

here $\mathrm{med}_\nu f$ denotes any median of f with respect to ν, i.e. a median of the push-forward of ν by f.

Given two Borel probability measures ν_1, ν_2 defined on (X, d), we will require the following particular case of [6, Proposition 2.2] for transferring concentration information from $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{K}(X, d, \nu_1)$ to $\mathcal{K}_2 = \mathcal{K}(X, d, \nu_2)$.

Proposition 3.1 (Barthe–Milman)**.** *Assume that* $\|\frac{d\nu_2}{d\nu_1}\|_{L^p(\nu_1)} \leq L$ *for some* $p \in (1, \infty]$. *Then setting* $q = p^* = \frac{p}{p-1}$, *we have:*

$$\mathcal{K}_2(r) \leq 2L\mathcal{K}_1^{1/q}(r/2) \quad \forall r > 0.$$

We will use Proposition 3.1 with both $p < \infty$ and $p = \infty$. The latter simpler case, on which the proof of Proposition 3.1 is in fact based, was originally proved in [51, Lemma 3.1] (with more precise numerical constants).

3.1 Linearized Measure on Annulus

Given a compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ containing the origin in its interior, let $\|x\|_\Omega := \inf\{\lambda > 0 \; ; \; x \in \lambda\Omega\}$ denotes its associated gauge function on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ denote a general log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given $E > E_0 := V(0)$, denote by $K_E := \{V \leq E\}$ the convex level-set of V at level E, which necessarily contains the origin in its interior. Define the following measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\mu_{K_E} := \frac{1}{Z_E} e^{-(E + n(\|x\|_{K_E} - 1))} dx,$$

where $Z_E > 0$ is a normalization constant ensuring that μ_{K_E} is a probability measure. Integration in polar coordinates easily yields:

$$Z_E = \frac{n! e^n}{n^n} e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E).$$

Given an additional parameter $w \in (0, 1]$, we define the probability measure $\mu_{K_E, w}$ by conditioning μ_{K_E} on the annulus $1 - w \leq \|x\|_{K_E} \leq 1$, namely:

$$\mu_{K_E, w} := \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}} e^{-(E + n(\|x\|_{K_E} - 1))} 1_{\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1]} dx,$$

where again $Z_{E,w} > 0$ is an appropriate normalization constant. Note that the density of $\mu_{K_E, w}$ on the unit-sphere $\{\|x\|_{K_E} = 1\}$ is constant and thus proportional to that of μ. Furthermore, we will later see that our choice of the potential's slope (namely the coefficient n above) coincides *on-average* with that of μ. Consequently, the measure μ_{K_E} should be thought of as a version of μ whose potential has been linearized about the unit-sphere $\{\|x\|_{K_E} = 1\}$, with $\mu_{K_E, w}$ being in addition restricted to the annulus $\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1 - w, 1]$.

Remark 3.2. Most of the results in this work would remain valid (after adjusting numerical constants) if we were to replace the annulus $\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1]$ with (the perhaps more natural) $\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1+w]$. The only exception is Lemma 3.4 below, in which we use the fact that $V \leq E$ inside $\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1]$, explaining our choice to work with the latter one.

We will typically set $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}$ due to the following:

Lemma 3.3. *For all $w_0 \in [0,1]$, if $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}$ then:*

$$Z_{E,w} \geq c w_0 Z_E,$$

for some universal numeric constant $c > 0$.

Proof. Let X denote a random vector distributed according to $\mu_{K_E} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-n \|x\|_{K_E}) dx$. Observe that $\|X\|_{K_E}$ is distributed according to the Gamma distribution $\frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} e^{-nr} r^{n-1} dr$, and that:

$$\frac{Z_{E,w}}{Z_E} = \mathbb{P}(\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1]) = \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} \int_{1-w}^{1} e^{-nr} r^{n-1} dr.$$

The claim for w_0 of the order of 1 is already clear, since the latter Gamma distribution may be realized as the law of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$, where Y_i is a sequence of i.i.d. exponential random variables with parameter 1, so that $\mathbb{E}(Y_i) = \mathrm{Var}(Y_i) = 1$ and hence $\mathbb{E}(\|X\|_{K_E}) = 1$ and $\mathrm{Var}(\|X\|_{K_E}) = \frac{1}{n}$; similarly, it is possible to extend this reasoning to all $w_0 \in [\frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}, 1]$ using the Berry–Esseen Theorem (e.g. [55]). To see the claim for all $w_0 \in [0,1]$, we use the fact that the density of the Gamma distribution is unimodal, and so we may lower bound the above integral as follows:

$$\geq \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} w \min\left(e^{-n(1-w)} (1-w)^{n-1}, e^{-n} \right).$$

Using Stirling's formula, we see that $w \frac{n^n}{(n-1)!} e^{-n} = w\sqrt{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} (1 + o(1))$ as $n \to \infty$, and in particular $\geq c' w_0$ for some constant $c' > 0$ and all $n \geq 1$. It remains to note that:

$$e^{nw} (1-w)^{n-1} \geq (1+w)^n (1-w)^{n-1} \geq (1-w^2)^{n-1} = \left(1 - \frac{w_0^2}{n}\right)^{n-1} \geq c'' > 0,$$

for all $w_0 \in [0,1]$ and $n \geq 1$ (with 0^0 interpreted as 1). This concludes the proof. □

3.2 Dimension-Dependent Estimate

Our proof of Theorem 2.6 employs the following simple dimension-dependent estimate:

Lemma 3.4. *For any log-concave probability measure $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$, $E > V(0)$ and $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}$ with $w_0 \in (0, 1]$, we have:*

$$\left\| \frac{d\mu_{K_E,w}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{c w_0 Z_E} \exp(w_0 \sqrt{n}),$$

where $c > 0$ is the constant from Lemma 3.3.

Proof. Note that $V \leq E$ for all $\|x\|_{K_E} \leq 1$, and in particular on the annulus $\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1 - w, 1]$. It follows that on this annulus:

$$\frac{d\mu_{K_E,w}}{d\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}} \exp(V - E - n(\|x\|_{K_E} - 1)) \leq \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}} e^{nw},$$

and the assertion follows by Lemma 3.3. □

We will see that this is already enough to deduce the worst-case $\log(1 + n)$ estimate of Theorem 1.1.

3.3 Dimension-Independent Estimate

To obtain a dimension-independent estimate, we restrict ourselves in this subsection to product measures μ. Let $V_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, denote a sequence of convex functions so that $\mu_i := \exp(-V_i(y))dy$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Denote $V(x) := \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let μ denote the corresponding product measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\mu := \mu_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mu_n = \exp(-V(x))dx.$$

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on the following crucial estimate. The proof strategy is in some sense similar to the one employed in [6], where a zeroth order approximation was used about a hyperplane (instead of a first order approximation about a convex hypersurface as in the present case).

Proposition 3.5. *Let $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n$ be defined as in Theorem 2.1, recall that $A_2 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n\|_2$ and set $A_\infty := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n\|_\infty$. Let $w_0 \in (0, 1/2]$, $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}$ and $p \geq 1$. Assume that $A_\infty \leq \frac{1}{4pCw_0}$ where $C > 0$ is the constant from Theorem 3.6 below, and let $c > 0$ be the constant from Lemma 3.3. Then for all $E > E_0$:*

$$\int \left(\frac{d\mu_{K_E,w}}{d\mu} \right)^p d\mu \leq \frac{3 + 4\sqrt{\pi}}{Z_E^p} \frac{1}{(cw_0)^p} \exp(2Cp^2 w_0^2 A_2^2).$$

For the proof, we will require the following useful concentration-inequality for sums of independent (real-valued) random-variables (see e.g. [61, Lemma 2.2.11] or [16, Corollary 2.11]). Recall that the $L^{\Psi_1}(\nu)$-norm of a measurable function f on a probability-space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \nu)$ is defined as follows (our slightly non-standard normalization is meant to ensure that $\|1\|_{L^{\Psi_1}(\nu)} = 1$):

$$\|f\|_{L^{\Psi_1}(\nu)} := \inf\left\{t > 0 \; ; \; \int e^{\frac{|f|}{t}} d\nu \leq e\right\}.$$

Theorem 3.6 (Bernstein)**.** *Let $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ denote a sequence of independent random variables so that $\mathbb{E}(Y_i) = 0$ and $a_i := \|Y_i\|_{L^{\Psi_1}} < \infty$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Denoting $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, there exists a universal numeric constant $C > 0$, so that:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \geq r\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{C}\min\left(\frac{r^2}{\|a\|_2^2}, \frac{r}{\|a\|_\infty}\right)\right) \quad \forall r > 0.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Recall that K_E was defined as the convex level set $\{V \leq E\}$, and so for all $x \neq 0$, $V(\frac{x}{1+t}) = E$ with $t := \|x\|_{K_E} - 1$. Consequently, for all $r \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} g(r) &:= \mu\left\{\|x\|_{K_E} \in [1-w, 1] \; ; \; V(x) - (E + n(\|x\|_{K_E} - 1)) \geq r\right\} \\ &\leq \mu\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \exists t \in [-w, 0] \; , \; V(x) - \left(V\left(\frac{x}{1+t}\right) + nt\right) \geq r\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By convexity of V, we know that on the subset of full measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ where V is differentiable we have:

$$V\left(\frac{x}{1+t}\right) = V\left(x - \frac{t}{1+t}x\right) \geq V(x) - \frac{t}{1+t}\left\langle \nabla V(x), x\right\rangle,$$

and so we may continue the chain of inequalities above as follows (as $1 + t \geq 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mu\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \exists t \in [-w, 0] \; , \; \frac{t}{1+t}\left\langle \nabla V(x), x\right\rangle - nt \geq r\right\} \\ &\leq \mu\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \exists t \in [-w, 0] \; , \; t\left\langle \nabla V(x), x\right\rangle - nt \geq r(1+t) + nt^2\right\} \\ &\leq \mu\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; |\langle \nabla V(x), x\rangle - n| \geq r\frac{1-w}{w}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Note that if X is a random-vector distributed according to μ, then $\langle \nabla V(X), X\rangle - n = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$, where $Y_i := V_i'(X_i)X_i - 1$ are independent random-variables with each X_i distributed according to μ_i. Integrating by parts, we clearly have:

$$\mathbb{E}Y_i = \int x_i V_i'(x_i)\exp(-V_i(x_i))dx_i - 1 = 0,$$

and our integrability assumption (2.1) precisely translates to $\|Y_i\|_{L^{\Psi_1}} \leq \alpha_i$. Applying Bernstein's inequality (Theorem 3.6), we deduce:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i\right| \geq \sqrt{n}s\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{1}{C}\min\left(\frac{s^2}{A_2^2}, \frac{s}{A_\infty}\right)\right) \quad \forall s > 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Since we assume that $w = \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\frac{1-w}{w} \geq \frac{1}{2w}$, so we apply the above inequality with $s = \frac{r}{2w_0}$ to estimate (3.1), and deduce that:

$$g(r) \leq 2\exp\left(-\min\left(\frac{r^2}{4Cw_0^2A_2^2}, \frac{r}{2Cw_0A_\infty}\right)\right).$$

Integrating by parts, using the elementary inequalities $e^{-\min(a,b)} \leq e^{-a} + e^{-b}$ and $x \leq \exp(x^2)$, and our assumption that $p - \frac{1}{2Cw_0A_\infty} \leq -p$, we can now deduce:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \left(\frac{d\mu_{K_E,w}}{d\mu}\right)^p d\mu &= \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}^p} \int \exp\left(p\left(V(x) - \left(E + n(\|x\|_{K_E} - 1)\right)\right)\right) 1_{|\|x\|_{K_E} - 1| \leq w} d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}^p}\left(1 + \int_0^\infty p\exp(pr)g(r)dr\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}^p}\left(3 + 2\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{2C}pw_0A_2\exp(Cp^2w_0^2A_2^2)\right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{Z_{E,w}^p}\left(3 + 4\sqrt{\pi}\exp(2Cp^2w_0^2A_2^2)\right) \\
&\leq \frac{3 + 4\sqrt{\pi}}{Z_{E,w}^p}\exp(2Cp^2w_0^2A_2^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The asserted estimate then follows by recalling Lemma 3.3. □

Remark 3.7. The proof presented above is essentially the only place in this work where the product structure of $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ (or equivalently, the separable structure of $V(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i)$) is used. The sole purpose of this product structure is to obtain (3.2), asserting a strong concentration of $\langle \nabla V(X), X\rangle$ around its mean n. Any other condition which ensures a similar strong concentration would equally result in confirmation of the KLS conjecture for additional classes of convex bodies, simply by following the arguments in this work.

4 Properties of the level-set K_E

4.1 Bounding $\mathrm{Vol}(K_E)$

To apply the bound of Proposition 3.5, we will need to bound Z_E from below, where recall:

$$Z_E = \frac{n! e^n}{n^n} e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \ , \ K_E = \{V \leq E\} \, .$$

Definition. *Given $q \geq 0$, denote:*

$$\mathit{Level}^{(q)}(V) := \left\{ E \geq 0 \ ; \ e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \geq e^{-q} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} \right\} = \left\{ E \geq 0 \ ; \ Z_E \geq e^{-q} \right\} , \quad (4.1)$$

the subset of good level-sets of V.

Consequently, our goal will be to study $\mathrm{Level}^{(q)}(V)$; obviously this family is monotone increasing in q. Note that $\mathrm{Level}(V)$ defined in Section 2 is precisely $\mathrm{Level}^{(1)}(V)$. All of our results in this work remain valid with $\mathrm{Level}^{(1)}(V)$ replaced by $\mathrm{Level}^{(q)}(V)$ for any $q \geq 1$, with an additional appropriate dependence on q, but with the exception of this section, we refrain from this extraneous generality.

Now observe that the convexity of V ensures that the map:

$$\mathbb{R}_+ \ni E \mapsto g(E) := \mathrm{Vol}(K_E)^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

is a concave function on its support by the Brunn-Minkowski inequality (e.g. [58, 28]). By separability $\min V = \sum_{i=1}^n \min V_i = 0$, and so g is supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Note that we do not assume that $g(0) = 0$. Lastly, integration by parts yields:

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-E} g(E)^n dE = \int_0^\infty e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}\left\{V \leq E\right\} dE = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-V(x)} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\mu = 1. \quad (4.2)$$

On the basis of these three properties, we will prove a slightly more detailed version of assertions (1) - (4) of Proposition 2.3 from the Introduction:

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ denote a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\min V = 0$. For $E \geq 0$ let $K_E := \{V \leq E\}$, and let $\mathit{Level}^{(q)}(V)$ be defined by (4.1) for $q \geq 0$. Then:*

(1) $\mathit{Level}^{(q)}(V)$ is a non-empty closed interval $[E^{(q)}_{\min}, E^{(q)}_{\max}]$.

(2) $E^{(q)}_{\min} \leq n$.

(3) $q \leq E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min} \leq e^q \frac{n! e^n}{n^n} = e^q \sqrt{2\pi n}(1 + o(1))$ as $n \to \infty$.

(4) Denoting $c_n^{(q)} := e^{-\frac{q}{n}} \frac{n/e}{(n!)^{1/n}} \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$*, we have:*

$$c_n^{(q)} \leq \mathrm{Vol}(K_{E_{\min}})^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq 1 \vee e c_n^{(q)} \ , \ c_n^{(q)} \leq \mathrm{Vol}(K_{E_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq e c_n^{(q)} (1 + o(1)).$$

The proof is a based on the following:

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *denote a (non-decreasing) non-negative concave function, so that:*

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-t} g(t)^n dt = 1.$$

Let M_g *denote the maximum of* $e^{-t} g(t)^n$ *on* $\mathbb{R}_+$*, and let* $t_g > 0$ *denote the (necessarily unique) point on which it is attained. Then* $t_g \leq n$ *and* $M_g \geq e^{-n} \frac{n^n}{n!}$*.*

Remark 4.3. Observe that both asserted estimates are sharp for the model function $g_0(t) := \frac{t}{(n!)^{1/n}}$, which indeed satisfies $\int_0^\infty e^{-t} g_0(t)^n dt = 1$.

Remark 4.4. There are numerous instances in the literature of similar looking lemmas regarding measures on $\mathbb{R}_+$ of the form $e^{g(t)} t^{n-1} dt$ with g concave (and typically decreasing), arising when integrating a log-concave measure in $\mathbb{R}^n$ in polar coordinates (see e.g. [41, Lemma 2.1 and 2.2]). However, we emphasize that it is not possible to obtain the delicate lower bound we need on $e^{-E}\mathrm{Vol}(K_E)$ by integrating $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ in polar coordinates - it is not hard to check there there is no fixed value of E (including the typical guess $E = n$) that will in general work for every ray simultaneously.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. First, note that t_g is indeed unique since $e^{t/n}$ is not concave on any non-empty open interval. For simplicity, we may assume (by approximation) that g is differentiable. The maximum of $t \mapsto h(t) := -t + n \log g(t)$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ is attained at t_g, and hence either $t_g = 0$ or $g'(t_g) = \frac{g(t_g)}{n}$. In the latter case, concavity implies that $g'(t_g) \leq \frac{g(t_g) - g(0)}{t_g} \leq \frac{g(t_g)}{t_g}$, and therefore $t_g \leq n$. In the former case, necessarily $h'(0) \leq 0$, i.e. $g'(0) \leq \frac{g(0)}{n}$. In either case, concavity implies:

$$g(t_g + s) \leq g(t_g) + g'(t_g) s \leq g(t_g) \left(1 + \frac{s}{n}\right) \quad \forall s \in [-t_g, \infty).$$

Consequently:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} g(t)^n dt \leq M_g \int_{-t_g}^\infty e^{-s} \left(1 + \frac{s}{n}\right)^n ds \leq M_g \int_{-n}^\infty e^{-s} \left(1 + \frac{s}{n}\right)^n ds \\ &= M_g e^n \int_0^\infty e^{-t} \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^n dt = M_g e^n \frac{n!}{n^n}, \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. □

In fact, although this will not be used anywhere else in this work, we can claim the following:

Proposition 4.5. *With the same assumptions and notation as in Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.3, there exists an increasing and contracting map $T : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ so that T pushes forward the probability measure $e^{-t} g_0(t)^n dt$ onto $e^{-t} g(t)^n dt$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$.*
In particular, we have $t'_g := T(n) \leq n$ and $e^{-t'_g} g(t'_g)^n \geq e^{-n} g_0(n)^n = e^{-n} \frac{n^n}{n!}$.

This should be compared with a well-known contraction result established by L. Caffarelli in [19] (see also [34] for generalizations), asserting that the Brenier optimal-transport map T pushing forward a Gaussian probability measure γ_n on $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto a probability measure $\mu = \exp(-V)\gamma_n$ with $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ convex, is in fact contracting Euclidean distance. While we do not know how to extend Proposition 4.5 to higher-dimension, we can obtain contraction results between members of an entire family of one-dimensional model spaces and appropriate concave perturbations thereof, including both the Gaussian measure and the measure $e^{-t} g_0(t)^n dt$ as particular cases. As this is too off-topic for this work, these contraction results, as well as the proof of Proposition 4.5, will appear elsewhere.

Let us now complete the proof of Proposition 4.1:

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Lemma 4.2 implies that $t_g \in \mathrm{Level}^{(q)}(V)$ for all $q \geq 0$. As the function $E \mapsto e^{-E} g(E)^n$ is integrable, continuous and unimodal (as its logarithm is concave), $\mathrm{Level}^{(q)}(V)$ must be a closed interval $[E^{(q)}_{\min}, E^{(q)}_{\max}] \subset [0, \infty)$. Lemma 4.2 implies that $E^{(q)}_{\min} \leq t_g \leq n$. We also have:

$$1 = \int_0^\infty e^{-E} g(E)^n dE \geq \int_{E^{(q)}_{\min}}^{E^{(q)}_{\max}} e^{-E} g(E)^n dE \geq (E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min}) e^{-q} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!},$$

implying that $E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min} \leq e^q \frac{n! e^n}{n^n} = e^q \sqrt{2\pi n}(1 + o(1))$ by Stirling's formula. To see the reverse inequality, observe that $W(t) := t - n \log g(t)$ satisfies $W'(t) \leq 1$, and therefore:

$$e^{-W(t_g + q)} \geq e^{-q} e^{-W(t_g)} \geq e^{-q} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!}.$$

Consequently $t_g + q \in \mathrm{Level}^{(q)}(V)$, implying $E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min} \geq q$. Clearly:

$$\mathrm{Vol}(K_{E^{(q)}_{\min}})^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq e^{\frac{E^{(q)}_{\min}}{n}} e^{-\frac{q}{n}} c_n,$$

with $c_n = \frac{n/e}{(n!)^{1/n}} \to 1$ by Stirling's formula, where the only possible strict inequality above is when $E^{(q)}_{\min} = 0$, in which case $\mathrm{Vol}(K_0) \leq 1$ (as $\int \exp(-V) dx = 1$). Since

$E^{(q)}_{\min} \in [0,n]$, the upper and lower estimates on $\mathrm{Vol}(K_{E^{(q)}_{\min}})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ follow. Finally, note that:

$$\mathrm{Vol}(K_{E^{(q)}_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{n}} = e^{\frac{E^{(q)}_{\max}}{n}} e^{-\frac{q}{n}} c_n = e^{\frac{E^{(q)}_{\min}}{n}} e^{-\frac{q}{n}} c_n e^{\frac{E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min}}{n}},$$

and so the upper estimate on $\mathrm{Vol}(K_{E^{(q)}_{\max}})^{\frac{1}{n}}$ follows since $(E^{(q)}_{\max} - E^{(q)}_{\min})/n = e^q \sqrt{2\pi/n}(1 + o(1)) = o(1)$ as $n \to \infty$. This completes the proof. □

4.2 Barycenter of μ

We now turn to prove assertion (6) of Proposition 2.3, which we equivalently reformulate as follows:

Proposition 4.6 (Refinement of Fradelizi's Bound)**.** *With the same assumptions and notation as in Proposition 4.1, let $b_\mu := \int x \, d\mu(x)$ denote the barycenter of μ. Then $V(b_\mu) \leq (E^{(1)}_{\max} - 1) \wedge n$, i.e. $b_\mu \in K_{(E^{(1)}_{\max}-1)\wedge n}$.*

Remark 4.7. In [26], M. Fradelizi showed that under the same assumptions $V(b_\mu) \leq n$ – we will present a simplified proof of this bound below. While this is sharp whenever μ is log-affine on an appropriate convex cone, it is easy to construct (non-trivial) examples when this estimate can be significantly improved. For instance, let $V(x) = \|x\|_K^p$ for any convex body K having the origin in its interior and $p \geq 1$ (and K is scaled so that μ is a probability measure). In that case, it is immediate to check that $g(E) := \mathrm{Vol}(K_E)^{1/n} = c_{n,p} E^{1/p}$ (with $c_{n,p} = \Gamma(n/p+1)^{-1/n}$), and we have $t_g := \arg\max_E e^{-E}\mathrm{Vol}(K_E) = n/p$ with the notation of Lemma 4.2. As $t_g \in [E^{(1)}_{\min}, E^{(1)}_{\max}]$ and $E^{(1)}_{\max} - E^{(1)}_{\min} \leq e\sqrt{2\pi n}(1 + o(1))$, we conclude that $E^{(1)}_{\max} = n/p(1 + o(1))$ as $n \to \infty$, yielding a strict improvement over Fradelizi's estimate for any fixed $p > 1$ and large enough n.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. We may assume by translating μ if necessary that the minimum of V as attained at the origin. It follows by Jensen's inequality, convexity of V and integration by parts, that:

$$V(b_\mu) \leq \int V(x) e^{-V(x)} dx \leq \int \langle \nabla V(x), x \rangle \, e^{-V(x)} dx = \int \mathrm{div}(x) e^{-V(x)} dx = n,$$

immediately recovering Fradelizi's bound. To obtain our refinement, recall that $g(E) := \mathrm{Vol}(K_E)^{1/n}$ and introduce the following measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\nu := e^{-W(E)} dE = e^{-E} g(E)^n dE$$

Recall that by (4.2) ν is a probability measure, and as g is concave W is in particular convex and hence ν is log-concave. Applying again Jensen's inequality, but now integrating by parts on the distribution of $\mathrm{Vol}\,\{V \leq E\}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} V(b_\mu) &\leq \int V(x) e^{-V(x)} dx = -\int_0^\infty \frac{d}{dE}(E e^{-E}) \mathrm{Vol}\,\{V \leq E\}\, dE \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{-E}(E-1)\mathrm{Vol}(K_E) dE = \int_0^\infty E e^{-E} g(E)^n dE - 1, \end{aligned}$$

so it remains to show that:

$$b_\nu := \int_0^\infty E d\nu(E) \leq E^{(1)}_{\max}.$$

Note that b_ν is precisely the barycenter of log-concave probability measure ν, and hence by Fradelizi's bound in the one-dimensional case, $W(b_\nu) \leq W(t_g) + 1$, where recalling the notation of Lemma 4.2, t_g is the maximum point of e^{-W}. Invoking Lemma 4.2, we obtain:

$$e^{-b_\nu}\mathrm{Vol}(K_{b_\nu}) = e^{-W(b_\nu)} \geq \frac{1}{e} e^{-W(t_g)} \geq \frac{1}{e}\frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!}.$$

It follows by definition that $b_\nu \in \mathrm{Level}^{(1)}(V)$, so in particular $b_\nu \leq E^{(1)}_{\max}$, concluding the proof.

□

4.3 Barycenter and covariance matrix of K_E

We conclude this section by providing a proof of assertions (7) and (8) of Proposition 2.3. Recall that X_μ and X_E are assumed to be distributed according to μ and λ_{K_E}, respectively, and that we denote the corresponding barycenters:

$$b_\mu := \mathbb{E}(X_\mu)\ ,\ b_E := \mathbb{E}(X_E),$$

and covariance matrices:

$$\mathrm{Cov}_\mu := \mathbb{E}((X_\mu - b_\mu) \otimes (X_\mu - b_\mu))\ ,\ \mathrm{Cov}_E := \mathbb{E}((X_E - b_E) \otimes (X_E - b_E)).$$

Note that by definition:

$$D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) = \max_{\theta \in S^{n-1}} \sqrt{\langle \mathrm{Cov}_\mu\, \theta, \theta \rangle},$$

where S^{n-1} denotes the Euclidean unit-sphere in $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$.

Proposition 4.8. *For all $q \geq 0$ and $E \in [E_{\min}^{(q)}, E_{\max}^{(q)}]$:*

(1) $|b_E - b_\mu| \leq C(1+q)\log(1+n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\mu)$.

(2) $Cov_E \leq C'(1+q)^2 \log^2(1+n)\, Cov_\mu$ *as positive-definite matrices.*

Here $C, C' > 0$ are two universal numeric constants.

Proof. Assume by translating μ if necessary that $b_\mu = 0$. For any $\theta \in S^{n-1}$, a well-known consequence of Borell's lemma [15] (cf. [1, Appendix A]) is that:

$$\mu(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t) \leq \exp(-Ct/L_\theta) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \ ,$$

where $L_\theta := \sqrt{\langle \mathrm{Cov}_\mu\, \theta, \theta \rangle}$ and $C > 0$ is a numeric constant. On the other hand:

$$\mu(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t) \geq e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \lambda_{K_E}(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t) \geq \frac{1}{e^q} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} \lambda_{K_E}(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t),$$

for any $E \in [E_{\min}^{(q)}, E_{\max}^{(q)}]$. Applying this to $t = t_\theta := \langle b_E, \theta \rangle$, note that:

$$\lambda_{K_E}(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t_\theta) = \lambda_{K_E}(\langle x - b_E, \theta \rangle \geq 0) \geq \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^n \geq \frac{1}{e},$$

by Grünbaum's Theorem [30] (cf. [27]) on the volume of halfspaces passing through the barycenter of a convex body. Combining everything, we obtain by Stirling's formula:

$$\exp(-C \left\langle b_E, \theta \right\rangle / L_\theta) \geq \mu(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t_\theta) \geq \frac{1}{e^{q+1}\sqrt{2\pi n}} (1 + o(1)),$$

as $n \to \infty$. In particular, it follows (as $L_\theta = L_{-\theta}$) that:

$$|\langle b_E, \theta \rangle| \leq C_1(1+q)\log(1+n) L_\theta \leq C_1(1+q)\log(1+n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\mu), \tag{4.3}$$

establishing (in fact, a strengthening of) the first assertion.

The second assertion is proved similarly. Indeed, for all $\theta \in S^{n-1}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $E \in [E_{\min}^{(q)}, E_{\max}^{(q)}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{e^q} \frac{n^n e^{-n}}{n!} \lambda_{K_E}(\langle x - b_E, \theta \rangle \geq t) &\leq e^{-E} \mathrm{Vol}(K_E) \lambda_{K_E}(\langle x - b_E, \theta \rangle \geq t) \\ &\leq \mu(\langle x, \theta \rangle \geq t + \langle b_E, \theta \rangle) \leq \exp(-C(t + \langle b_E, \theta \rangle)/L_\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Invoking (4.3) and applying Stirling's formula again, we deduce that for all $\theta \in S^{n-1}$ and $t > 0$:

$$\lambda_{K_E}(|\langle x - b_E, \theta \rangle| \geq t) \leq 2(1+n)^{C_2(1+q)} \exp(-Ct/L_\theta).$$

Integrating by parts, it follows that:

$$\langle \mathrm{Cov}_E \theta, \theta \rangle = \int \langle x - b_E, \theta \rangle^2 \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x) \leq \int_0^\infty 2t \min(1, 2(1+n)^{C_2(1+q)} \exp(-Ct/L_\theta)) dt,$$

and the latter integral is easily seen to be bounded above by $C_3(1+q)^2 \log^2(1+n) L_\theta^2$, thereby concluding the proof. □

5 Transferring Concentration: From Annulus to Cone and Uniform Measures

Given two Borel probability measures μ_1, μ_2 on a common metric space (X, d), recall that their 1-Wasserstein distance $W_{d,1}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is defined as:

$$W_{d,1}(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \inf_\pi \int d(x, y) d\pi(x, y),$$

where the infimum is over all Borel probability measures π on $X \times X$ having first and second marginals μ_1 and μ_2, respectively. By the Monge–Kantorovich–Rubinstein dual characterization of $W_{d,1}$ (e.g. [62, Case 5.16]), we have:

$$W_{d,1}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup \left\{ \int f(d\mu_1 - d\mu_2) \; ; \; f : (X, d) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is 1-Lipschitz} \right\}.$$

The following immediate consequence of this dual characterization was first noted in [51, Lemma 5.4], allowing transferring first-moment concentration of Lipschitz functions between two measures which are close in $W_{d,1}$-distance:

Lemma 5.1 ([51])**.** *For any 1-Lipschitz function f on (X, d), we have:*

$$\int |f - med_{\mu_2} f| \, d\mu_2 \leq \int |f - med_{\mu_1} f| \, d\mu_1 + W_{d,1}(\mu_1, \mu_2).$$

Here $\mathrm{med}_\nu f \in \mathbb{R}$ denotes a median of f under the law of (the probability measure) ν, i.e. a median of the probability measure $f_* \nu$ on $\mathbb{R}$.

5.1 From Annulus to Cone Measure

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denote a compact set containing the origin in its interior and having Lipschitz boundary. We will say that Ω is a star-shaped body if in addition $\Omega = \{x \; ; \; \|x\|_\Omega \leq 1\}$. We denote by $\sigma_{\partial\Omega}$ the induced cone probability measure on $\partial\Omega$, i.e.

the push-forward of λ_Ω via the map $x \mapsto \frac{x}{\|x\|_\Omega}$. It is well-known and immediate to check that:

$$\sigma_{\partial\Omega} = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(\Omega)} \frac{\langle x, \nu \rangle}{n} \cdot \mathcal{H}^{n-1}|_{\partial\Omega},$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ denotes the $n-1$-dimensional Hausdorff measure in Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$, and ν denotes the ($\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$-a.e. defined) outer unit-normal to $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denote a star-shaped body, and let $\mu_{\Omega,w}$ denote any probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the form:*

$$\mu_{\Omega,w} := \Psi(\|x\|_\Omega) 1_{|\|x\|_\Omega - 1| \leq w} dx,$$

for some Borel function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $w > 0$. Then for any norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$W_{\|\cdot\|_0,1}(\mu_{\Omega,w}, \sigma_{\partial\Omega}) \leq \frac{n+1}{n} w \int \|x\|_0 \, d\lambda_\Omega(x). \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Let $T : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \to \partial\Omega$ be defined as $T(x) := \frac{x}{\|x\|_\Omega}$. Since the density of $\mu_{\Omega,w}$ depends only on $\|x\|_\Omega$, it is clear that T pushes forward $\mu_{\Omega,w}$ onto the cone measure $\sigma_{\partial\Omega}$. Now consider the probability measure π on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by pushing forward $\mu_{\Omega,w}$ via $\mathrm{Id} \times T$, having first and second marginals precisely $\mu_{\Omega,w}$ and $\sigma_{\partial\Omega}$, respectively. It follows by definition that:

$$\begin{aligned}
&W_{\|\cdot\|_0,1}(\mu_{\Omega,w}, \sigma_{\partial\Omega}) \leq \int \|y - x\|_0 \, d\pi(x,y) = \int \|T(x) - x\|_0 \, d\mu_{\Omega,w}(x) \\
&= \int |\|x\|_\Omega - 1| \, \|T(x)\|_0 \, d\mu_{\Omega,w}(x) \leq w \int \|T(x)\|_0 \, d\mu_{\Omega,w}(x) = w \int \|y\|_0 \, d\sigma_{\partial\Omega}(y) \\
&= w \int \frac{\|z\|_0}{\|z\|_\Omega} d\lambda_\Omega(z) = w \frac{n+1}{n} \int \|z\|_0 \, d\lambda_\Omega(z),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality may be easily verified e.g. by integration in polar coordinates. □

Remark 5.3. In fact, when $\Psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a log-concave function so that:

$$\int_{0 \vee (1-w)}^{1+w} \Psi(t) t^n dt = \int_{0 \vee (1-w)}^{1+w} \Psi(t) t^{n-1} dt,$$

(and in particular for the function $\Psi(t) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-nt)$ when $w = \infty$), one can do better than just using the very crude estimate $|\|x\|_\Omega - 1| \leq w$ as we did above. In that case, it is not very hard to show that one may replace w by $\min(w, \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}})$ in (5.1), for an appropriate universal constant $C > 0$. Moreover, an analogous estimate on

$W_1(\mu, \sigma_{\partial K_\mu})$ holds for a general log-concave probability measure μ and an appropriate associated convex body K_μ; as this is too off-topic, it will be developed elsewhere. In any case, since in this work we will only be interested in the range $w \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, we have chosen to only provide the most elementary estimate (5.1).

5.2 From Cone to Uniform Measure

The L^2 version of the following Hardy-type inequality was proved by the authors in [42, Theorem 1], reducing various spectral-gap questions from Ω to its boundary. We will require the following L^1 version, which in fact is more elementary. For completeness, we formulate it with respect to an arbitrary norm.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denote a star-shaped body. Then for any Lipschitz function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and any norm $\|\cdot\|_0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we have:*

$$\int |f - med_{\lambda_\Omega} f| \, d\lambda_\Omega \leq \frac{1}{n} \int \|x\|_0 \, \|\nabla f\|_0^* \, d\lambda_\Omega + \int_{\partial\Omega} |f - med_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f| \, d\sigma_{\partial\Omega}. \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, for any 1-Lipschitz function $f : (\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_0) \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\int |f - med_{\lambda_\Omega} f| \, d\lambda_\Omega \leq \frac{1}{n} \int \|x\|_0 \, d\lambda_\Omega + \int_{\partial\Omega} |f - med_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f| \, d\sigma_{\partial\Omega}. \tag{5.3}$$

Proof. Integrating by parts (see e.g. [54, 12.2]), we have for any smooth (and in fact, Lipschitz) vector field ξ and function g on Ω:

$$\int_\Omega div(\xi) g dx = -\int_\Omega \langle \xi, \nabla g \rangle \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \xi, \nu \rangle \, g \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

Applying this to $\xi(x) = x$, we obtain:

$$n \int_\Omega g dx \leq \int_\Omega \|x\|_0 \, \|\nabla g\|_0^* \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle x, \nu \rangle \, g \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

Setting $g = |f - \mathrm{med}_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f|$ and using that $\|\nabla g\|_0^* \leq \|\nabla f\|_0^*$, it follows that:

$$\int_\Omega |f - \mathrm{med}_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f| \, d\lambda_\Omega \leq \frac{1}{n} \int_\Omega \|x\|_0 \, \|\nabla f\|_0^* \, d\lambda_\Omega + \int_{\partial\Omega} |f - \mathrm{med}_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f| \, d\sigma_{\partial\Omega}.$$

Finally, the left-hand-side cannot increase if we replace $\mathrm{med}_{\sigma_{\partial\Omega}} f$ by $\mathrm{med}_{\lambda_\Omega} f$ there, yielding the assertion. □

Remark 5.5. It is also possible to obtain the particular case (5.3) by estimating $W_1(\nu_{\partial\Omega}, \lambda_\Omega)$ as in the previous subsection, but our proof above has the advantage that it yields the more general (5.2).

6 Putting Everything Together

6.1 Proof of Main Technical Theorem

We are now ready to present the proof of our Main Technical Theorem 2.1 by putting all of the ingredients from the previous sections together.

We first recall the following well-known facts about one-dimensional log-concave measures. Note that for any probability measure ν on $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\nu)^2 = \left\| \mathrm{Cov}_\nu \right\|_{op}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $\|\mathrm{Cov}_\nu\|_{op}$ denotes the operator norm of Cov_ν regarded as a linear operator. Consequently, in the one dimensional case we have $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\nu)^2 = \mathrm{Var}(X)$ where X is distributed according to ν.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\nu = f(x)dx$ denote a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Then:*

(1) The KLS conjecture is valid: $1 \leq D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\nu)^2 / D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\nu)^2 \leq 12$.

(2) We have $C_1 \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}^2 D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\nu)^2 \leq C_2$ for two universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

Proof. The first assertion is due to Bobkov [10, Corollary 4.3]. The second one may be found in [53] when f is even and in [35, Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6] in the general case. □

Recalling the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we are given that for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $\mu_i := \exp(-V_i(y))dy$ is a log-concave probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with $\min V_i = m_i$. It follows by Lemma 6.1 that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu_i) \leq \sqrt{12 C_2} e^{m_i}$ for every i. Since $\mu := \mu_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mu_n$ is a product measure, by the well-known tensorization property of the Poincaré inequality (e.g. [45]), we conclude that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \leq \sqrt{12 C_2} M$, where recall $M = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} e^{m_i} \geq 1$.

Next, given a probability measure ν on (say) $\mathbb{R}^n$, denote $\mathcal{K}_\nu = \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|, \nu)$. By a well-known result of M. Gromov and V. Milman [29] (see also [48, Corollary 2.7]), a Poincaré inequality always implies the following exponential concentration:

$$\mathcal{K}_\nu(r) \leq \exp\left(-c_0 r / D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\nu)\right) \quad \forall r > 0 \,, \tag{6.2}$$

for some universal numeric constant $c_0 > 0$. In fact, it is possible to use any $c_0 \in (0, 2)$ at the expense of using an additional multiplicative constant in from of the right-hand-side above (see [57, 14]), but we will not require this here. It follows that for our measure μ, we have for some numeric constant $c > 0$:

$$\mathcal{K}_\mu(r) \leq \exp(-cr/M) \quad \forall r > 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Applying Proposition 3.5 with, say $p = 2$, we obtain the following estimate, valid for all $w_0 \in (0, 1/2]$ so that $A_\infty \leq \frac{1}{8Cw_0}$ (where $C > 0$ is the constant from Bernstein's Theorem 3.6):

$$\left\| \frac{d\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^2(\mu)} \leq \frac{C'}{Z_E} \frac{1}{w_0} \exp(C' w_0^2 A_2^2) \quad \forall E > E_0. \tag{6.4}$$

By Proposition 4.1, we know that $Z_E \geq \frac{1}{e}$ on the entire non-empty closed interval $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$. Invoking Proposition 3.1, the resulting estimate (6.4) allows us to transfer the concentration estimate (6.3) from μ onto its linearized version $\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}$ on the corresponding annulus, yielding:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}}(r) \leq \frac{2eC'}{w_0} \exp(C' w_0^2 A_2^2) \exp\left(-\frac{cr}{4M}\right) \quad \forall r > 0 \quad \forall E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}] \cap (E_0, \infty).$$

In particular, for any 1-Lipschitz function f on $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ and any $r_0 \geq 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}} f \right| d\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}} &\leq r_0 + 2 \int_{r_0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}}(r) dr \\ &\leq r_0 + \frac{16eC'M}{cw_0} \exp\left(C' w_0^2 A_2^2 - \frac{cr_0}{4M}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Optimizing on r_0, we deduce for an appropriate numeric constant $C'' > 0$:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}} f \right| d\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq C'' M \left(w_0^2 A_2^2 + \log \frac{M}{w_0} \right). \tag{6.5}$$

Next, by Lemma 5.2 applied to K_E and $\mu_{K_E, w}$, we know that for all $w > 0$:

$$W_{|\cdot|,1}(\mu_{K_E, w}, \sigma_{\partial K_E}) \leq \frac{n+1}{n} w \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

Invoking Lemma 5.1, the latter estimate allows us to transfer the first-moment concentration (6.5) from $\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}$ onto the cone measure $\sigma_{\partial K_E}$, yielding for any 1-Lipschitz function f on $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\sigma_{\partial K_E}} f \right| d\sigma_{\partial K_E} \leq C'' M \left(w_0^2 A_2^2 + \log \frac{M}{w_0} \right) + \frac{n+1}{n} \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

Finally, we invoke Lemma 5.4 to transfer the latter first-moment concentration from $\sigma_{\partial K_E}$ to λ_{K_E}, yielding for all $w_0 \in (0, 1/2]$ so that $A_\infty \leq \frac{1}{8Cw_0}$:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\lambda_{K_E}} f \right| d\lambda_{K_E} \leq C'' M \left(w_0^2 A_2^2 + \log \frac{M}{w_0} \right) + \left(\frac{n+1}{n} \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

Optimizing on w_0, we set $w_0 := \frac{1}{(8CA_2)\vee 2} \in (0, 1/2]$, for which we clearly have $A_\infty \leq A_2 \leq \frac{1}{8Cw_0}$. Consequently, we obtain:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\lambda_{K_E}} f \right| d\lambda_{K_E} \leq C''' M \log(e + A_2 M) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

It remains to invoke the following result, established in [48] in a more general weighted Riemannian setting (see also [49, 50, 52] for refinements), asserting the equivalence between concentration, spectral-gap and linear-isoperimetry under appropriate convexity assumptions:

Theorem 6.2 ([48])**.** *For any log-concave probability measure ν on $\mathbb{R}^n$:*

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\nu) \leq C \sup \left\{ \int |f - \mathit{med}_\nu f| \, d\nu \; ; \; f : (\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is 1-Lipschitz} \right\},$$

with some universal numeric constant $C > 1$.

As K_E is convex and hence λ_{K_E} is a log-concave measure, this concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 2.6

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is identical to the one of Theorem 2.1 described in the previous subsection, with the only difference being in the first step – instead of invoking the L^p estimate given by Proposition 3.5 for transferring concentration from μ to $\mu_{K_E,w}$, we invoke the L^∞ estimate of Lemma 3.4. Let us sketch the argument.

By translating μ we may assume that $V(0) = \min V$, where recall the latter value is assumed to be 0. By Lemma 3.4, we have for all $w_0 \in (0, 1]$:

$$\left\| \frac{d\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{c w_0 Z_E} \exp(w_0 \sqrt{n}) \quad \forall E > 0. \tag{6.6}$$

By Proposition 4.1, we know that $Z_E \geq \frac{1}{e}$ on the interval $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$. Invoking Proposition 3.1 with $p = \infty$, we transfer the Gromov–Milman concentration (6.2) from μ onto $\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}$, yielding:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}}(r) \leq \frac{2e}{c w_0 Z_E} \exp(w_0 \sqrt{n}) \exp\left(- \frac{c_0 r}{2 D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)} \right) \quad \forall r > 0 \quad \forall E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}].$$

The rest of the proof is identical to the one in the previous subsection, with M replaced by $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)$ and $w_0^2 A_2^2$ replaced by $w_0 \sqrt{n}$. Note that just as with lower bound $M \geq 1$ in the previous subsection, our normalization ensures that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \geq c > 0$. Indeed:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \geq D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) = \|\mathrm{Cov}_\mu\|_{op}^{1/2} \geq (\det \mathrm{Cov}_\mu)^{1/2n} = L_\mu \geq c > 0,$$

where L_μ denotes the isotropic constant of μ, the last equality holds since we assume that $\mu = \exp(-V) dx$ with $\min V = 0$, and the inequality $L_\mu \geq c > 0$ for all log-concave measures μ is well-known (see [53, 38, 17] for more background on the isotropic constant).

Repeating the argument in the previous subsection, we obtain for any 1-Lipschitz function f on $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}}} f \right| d\mu_{K_E, \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}}} \leq C'' D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \left(w_0 \sqrt{n} + \log\left(e + \frac{D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)}{w_0} \right) \right).$$

Transferring concentration to $\sigma_{\partial K_E}$ and then to λ_{K_E} as before, we obtain for all $w_0 \in (0, 1]$:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\lambda_{K_E}} f \right| d\lambda_{K_E} \leq C'' D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \left(w_0 \sqrt{n} + \log\left(e + \frac{D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)}{w_0} \right) \right) + \left(\frac{n+1}{n} \frac{w_0}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} \right) \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

Setting $w_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, we deduce:

$$\int \left| f - \mathrm{med}_{\lambda_{K_E}} f \right| d\lambda_{K_E} \leq C''' D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \log(e + \sqrt{n} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu)) + \frac{3}{n} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E}.$$

Invoking Theorem 6.2, the assertion of Theorem 2.6 will follow as soon as we show that:

$$\frac{1}{n} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E} \leq C \log(1+n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \tag{6.7}$$

(since $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \geq c > 0$). Note that the barycenter of λ_{K_E} may not be at the origin.

To establish (6.7), note that by [33, Theorem 4.1], any convex body K in $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ satisfies:

$$K - \int x \, d\lambda_K \subset (n+1) \mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_K}^{1/2}(B_2^n),$$

where $\mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_K}^{1/2}$ is considered as a linear map acting on the Euclidean unit-ball B_2^n. Since $0 \in K_E$, it follows by (6.1) that:

$$\frac{1}{n} \int |x| \, d\lambda_{K_E} \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{diam}(K_E) \leq \frac{n+1}{n} \|\mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_{K_E}}\|_{op}^{1/2} \mathrm{diam}(B_2^n) = 2 \frac{n+1}{n} D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}).$$

But Proposition 2.3 (8):

$$\|\mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_{K_E}}\|_{op}^{1/2} \leq C \log(1+n) \|\mathrm{Cov}_{\mu}\|_{op}^{1/2} = C \log(1+n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\mu) \leq C \log(1+n) D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu),$$

thereby confirming (6.7), and hence concluding the proof of Theorem 2.6.

6.3 Proofs of Remaining Statements

Let us now conclude the proofs of assertion (5) of Proposition 2.3, Theorem 2.4, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and Corollary 2.5.

Proof of assertion (5) of Proposition 2.3. Note that:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E})^2 = \|\mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_{K_E}}\|_{op} \geq \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{tr}\ \mathrm{Cov}_{\lambda_{K_E}} = \frac{1}{n} \int |x - b_E|^2 \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x).$$

It follows by the well known bath-tub principle (see e.g. [53]) that:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E})^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \int |x|^2 \, d\lambda_{B_E},$$

where B_E is a Euclidean ball centered at the origin and having the same volume as K_E. Since $\mathrm{Vol}(B_E)^{1/n} = Vol(K_E)^{1/n} \geq c > 0$ for all $E \geq E_{\min}$ by Proposition 2.3 (4), an elementary and well-known computation (see again [53]) ensures that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(K_E) \geq c > 0$ for all E in that range, establishing assertion (5) of that proposition. Before concluding, also note that Jensen's inequality implies that:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x - b_E| \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x). \tag{6.8}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.4. For any $E \in \mathrm{Level}(V)$ and $b \in \mathrm{int}(K_E)$, the first assertion of Theorem 2.4 follows by Corollary 2.2, the triangle inequality and (6.8):

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) &\leq C_1 \left(M \log(e + A_2(b) M) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int |x - b| \, d\lambda_{K_E}(x) \right) \\ &\leq C_1 \left(M \log(e + A_2(b) M) + \frac{|b - b_E|}{\sqrt{n}} + D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As for the second assertion, the additive dependence in $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(K_E)$ above turns into a multiplicative one by changing the numerical constant C_1 and using that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}^{\mathrm{Lin}}(K_E) \geq c > 0$ for all $E \geq E_{\min}$ and that $M \geq 1$. Recall that necessarily $E_{\min} \leq (E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n$ by Proposition 2.3 (2) and (3). Consequently, whenever

$(E_{\max}-1)\wedge n < E \le E_{max}$ we may use $b = b_\mu$, which necessarily lies in $\mathrm{int}(K_E)$ in that range by Proposition 2.3 (6). Invoking Proposition 2.3 (7), we see that $\frac{|b_\mu - b_E|}{\sqrt{n}} = o(1)$ as $n \to \infty$, and so this term may be discarded at the expense of changing again numerical constants. Finally, we may also take $E = (E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n$ by a limiting argument. This concludes the proof. □

Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The dimension-independent part of the estimate of Theorem 1.1 immediately follows from an application of Theorem 2.4 with $E = (E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n$. The dimension-dependent part follows by Theorem 2.6 applied to $\mu = \mu_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mu_n$ since $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \le C$ as explained in Subsection 6.1 and since $D^{Lin}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \ge c$ for all $E \ge E_{\min}$ by Proposition 2.3 (5). The volume estimate (1.7) follows by Proposition 2.3 (4). Similarly, Theorem 1.2 in fact holds for all $E \in [E_{\min}, E_{\max}]$ by Theorem 2.6. □

Proof of Corollary 2.5. Recall that $\tilde{V}_i(y) = \tilde{W}_i(y) + \log z_i$ and that $\log z = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \log z_i$. Denote $V_i(y) := \tilde{V}_i(zy) - \log z$, and note that both $\exp(-\tilde{V}_i)dy$ and $\exp(-V_i)dy$ are probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$. Also note that:

$$V(x) = \tilde{W}(zx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i(zx_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i(x_i),$$

and since $\tilde{V}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{V}_i(x_i)$, we see that the probability measures $\tilde{\mu} := \exp(-\tilde{V})dx$ and $\mu := \exp(-V)dx$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ are rescaled versions of the other by a factor of z. Lastly, note that:

$$M = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} \frac{z_i}{z} = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} e^{\min V_i},$$

and that:

$$\min V = \sum_{i=1}^n \min V_i = \sum_{i=1}^n (\log z_i - \log z) = 0.$$

Consequently, we may apply Theorem 2.4 for the measure $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$, the functions $\{V_i\}$ and the associated levels sets K_E. By scale invariance, we have that $\alpha_i(V, b) = \alpha_i(\tilde{V}, \tilde{b})$ for all $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{b} = zb$. Clearly $\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}} = z b_\mu$ where $\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}} = \int x d\tilde{\mu}$ and $b_\mu = \int x d\mu$. The assertions for $\tilde{K}_E$ now immediately follow after taking into account that $\tilde{K}_E = zK_E$, implying that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) = z D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E})$ and $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) = z D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E})$. □

6.4 Confirmation of Examples 1.3 and 1.4

The assertion of Example 1.3 for $p_i^{\pm} \in [1, P]$ follows from Corollary 2.5. Indeed, denoting $\tilde{W}_i(y) := (y_+)^{p_i} + (y_-)^{p_i}$ and $z_i := \int \exp(-\tilde{W}_i(y))dy$, note that $c_1 \le z_i \le$

c_2 for some universal constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ independent of P. Consequently $c_1 \leq z := (\pi_{i=1}^n z_i)^{1/n} \leq c_2$, $M = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} \frac{z_i}{z} \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1}$, and Lemma 6.1 ensures that the probability measures $\tilde{\mu}_i := \frac{1}{z_i} \exp(-\tilde{W}_i(y))dy$ satisfy $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\tilde{\mu}_i) \leq C$ independently of P. Similarly, the barycenters $\tilde{b}_i := \int y d\tilde{\mu}_i(y)$ also satisfy $|b_i| \leq C$. Consequently, it is easy to check that for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$:

$$\left\| \tilde{W}_i'(y)(y - \tilde{b}_i) - 1 \right\|_{L^{\Psi_1}(\tilde{\mu}_i)} \leq C' P,$$

and hence $A_2(\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}}) \leq C' P$ with $\tilde{b}_{\tilde{\mu}} = (\tilde{b}_1, \ldots, \tilde{b}_n)$ the barycenter of $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{\mu}_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \tilde{\mu}_n$. It follows by Corollary 2.5 that for all $E \in [(E_{\max} - 1) \wedge n, E_{\max}]$ we have:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \leq C'' \log(e + P) D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}),$$

for:

$$\tilde{K}_E := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \; ; \; \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i(x_i) \leq E \right\}.$$

Since $\tilde{K}_E = z K_E$ and $c_1 \leq z \leq c_2$, the volume estimate (1.7) for $\tilde{K}_E$ follows from the one ensured for K_E by Proposition 2.3 (4). Similarly, the estimate $D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) = z D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{K_E}) \geq c_1 c > 0$ follows by Proposition 2.3 (5). Finally, denote $\mu = \exp(-V(x))dx$ with $V(x) = \tilde{W}(zx)$ where $\tilde{W}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i(x_i)$, and note that μ is a rescaling of $\tilde{\mu}$ by a factor of $\frac{1}{z}$. The dimension-dependent estimate:

$$D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E}) \leq C''' \log(e + n) D^{\mathrm{Lin}}_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\lambda_{\tilde{K}_E})$$

then follows by Theorem 2.6 applied to μ, since $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) = \frac{1}{z} D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\tilde{\mu})$ and $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\tilde{\mu}) \leq C$ by the tensorization property of the Poincaré inequality, as explained in Subsection 6.1.

When $p_i^{\pm} \in [2, P]$, the above estimates may in fact be improved – we briefly sketch the argument. In this range, the measures $\tilde{\mu}_i$ in fact satisfy a log-Sobolev inequality independently of P (for instance, since they are Lipschitz images of the Gaussian measure - see e.g. [44]). By the tensorization property of the log-Sobolev inequality, it follows that the measures $\tilde{\mu}$ and μ also satisfy the log-Sobolev inequality with a universal constant independent of P or n, and so by the Herbst argument satisfy a Gaussian-type concentration, instead of just an exponential one:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mu}(r) \leq \exp(-c r^2) \quad \forall r > 0;$$

we refer to [45] for more on the log-Sobolev inequality and the Herbst argument. Repeating the analysis in Subsections 6.1 and 6.2, one may check that results in a square-root improvement of the previous logarithmic estimates.

Lastly, Example 1.4 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2, since when $\mathrm{Hess} V \geq \rho^2 \mathrm{Id}$ for $\rho > 0$, the Bakry–Émery criterion [3] ensures in particular that $D_{\mathrm{Poin}}(\mu) \leq \frac{1}{\rho}$.

References

[1] D. Alonso-Gutierrez and J. Bastero. *Approaching the Kannan–Lovasz–Simonovits and Variance conjectures*, volume 2131 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 2015.

[2] M. Anttila, K. Ball, and I. Perissinaki. The central limit problem for convex bodies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(12):4723–4735, 2003.

[3] D. Bakry and M. Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84*, volume 1123 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 177–206. Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[4] K. Ball and V. H. Nguyen. Entropy jumps for isotropic log-concave random vectors and spectral gap. *Studia Math.*, 213(1):81–96, 2012.

[5] F. Barthe and D. Cordero-Erausquin. Invariances in variance estimates. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 106(1):33–64, 2013.

[6] F. Barthe and E. Milman. Transference principles for log-Sobolev and spectral-gap with applications to conservative spin systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 323(2):575–625, 2013.

[7] F. Barthe and P. Wolff. Remarks on non-interacting conservative spin systems: the case of gamma distributions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(8):2711–2723, 2009.

[8] S. Bobkov. Extremal properties of half-spaces for log-concave distributions. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(1):35–48, 1996.

[9] S. Bobkov. On isoperimetric constants for log-concave probability distributions. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis, Israel Seminar 2004-2005*, volume 1910 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 81–88. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[10] S. G. Bobkov. Isoperimetric and analytic inequalities for log-concave probability measures. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(4):1903–1921, 1999.

[11] S. G. Bobkov. Spectral gap and concentration for some spherically symmetric probability measures. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, volume 1807 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 37–43. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[12] S. G. Bobkov and C. Houdré. Isoperimetric constants for product probability measures. *Ann. Probab.*, 25(1):184–205, 1997.

[13] S. G. Bobkov and A. Koldobsky. On the central limit property of convex bodies. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, volume 1807 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 44–52. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[14] S. G. Bobkov and M. Ledoux. Poincaré's inequalities and Talagrand's concentration phenomenon for the exponential distribution. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(3):383–400, 1997.

[15] Ch. Borell. Convex measures on locally convex spaces. *Ark. Mat.*, 12:239–252, 1974.
[16] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration Inequalities: A Nonasymptotic Theory of Independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
[17] S. Brazitikos, Giannopoulos A., Valettas P., and Vritsiou B.-H. *Geometry of Isotropic Convex Bodies*, volume 196 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. Amer. Math. Soc., 2014.
[18] P. Buser. A note on the isoperimetric constant. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 15(2):213–230, 1982.
[19] L. A. Caffarelli. Monotonicity properties of optimal transportation and the FKG and related inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 214(3):547–563, 2000.
[20] J. Cheeger. A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian. In *Problems in analysis (Papers dedicated to Salomon Bochner, 1969)*, pages 195–199. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J., 1970.
[21] R. Eldan. Thin shell implies spectral gap up to polylog via a stochastic localization scheme. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 23(2):532–569, 2013.
[22] R. Eldan and B. Klartag. Approximately gaussian marginals and the hyperplane conjecture. In C. Houdré, M. Ledoux, E. Milman, and M. Milman, editors, *Concentration, Functional Inequalities and Isoperimetry*, volume 545 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 55–68. Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.
[23] B. Fleury. Between Paouris concentration inequality and variance conjecture. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 46(2):299–312, 2010.
[24] B. Fleury. Concentration in a thin euclidean shell for log-concave measures. *J. Func. Anal.*, 259:832–841, 2010.
[25] B. Fleury. Poincaré inequality in mean value for Gaussian polytopes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 152(1-2):141–178, 2012.
[26] M. Fradelizi. Sections of convex bodies through their centroid. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 69(6):515–522, 1997.
[27] M. Fradelizi. Contributions à la géométrie des convexes. Méthodes fonctionnelles et probabilistes. Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches de l'Université Paris-Est Marne La Vallée, 2008. http://perso-math.univ-mlv.fr/users/fradelizi.matthieu/pdf/HDR.pdf.
[28] R. J. Gardner. The Brunn-Minkowski inequality. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 39(3):355–405, 2002.
[29] M. Gromov and V. D. Milman. A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality. *Amer. J. Math.*, 105(4):843–854, 1983.
[30] B. Grünbaum. Partitions of mass-distributions and of convex bodies by hyperplanes. *Pacific J. Math.*, 10:1257–1261, 1960.
[31] O. Guédon and E. Milman. Interpolating thin-shell and sharp large-deviation estimates for isotropic log-concave measures. *Geom. Func. Anal.*, 21(5):1043–1068, 2011.
[32] N. Huet. Spectral gap for some invariant log-concave probability measures. *Mathematika*, 57(1):51–62, 2011.
[33] R. Kannan, L. Lovász, and M. Simonovits. Isoperimetric problems for convex

bodies and a localization lemma. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 13(3-4):541–559, 1995.

[34] Y.-H. Kim and E. Milman. A generalization of Caffarelli's contraction theorem via (reverse) heat flow. *Math. Ann.*, 354(3):827–862, 2012.

[35] B. Klartag. On convex perturbations with a bounded isotropic constant. *Geom. and Funct. Anal.*, 16(6):1274–1290, 2006.

[36] B. Klartag. A central limit theorem for convex sets. *Invent. Math.*, 168:91–131, 2007.

[37] B. Klartag. Power-law estimates for the central limit theorem for convex sets. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 245:284–310, 2007.

[38] B. Klartag. Uniform almost sub-Gaussian estimates for linear functionals on convex sets. *Algebra i Analiz*, 19(1):109–148, 2007.

[39] B. Klartag. A Berry-Esseen type inequality for convex bodies with an unconditional basis. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 45(1):1–33, 2009.

[40] B. Klartag. Concentration of measures supported on the cube. *Israel J. Math.*, 203(1):59–80, 2014.

[41] B. Klartag and V. D. Milman. Geometry of log-concave functions and measures. *Geom. Dedicata*, 112:169–182, 2005.

[42] A. V. Kolesnikov and E. Milman. Remarks on the KLS conjecture and hardy-type inequalities. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis, Israel Seminar 2011-2013*, volume 2116 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 273–292. Springer, Berlin, 2014.

[43] A. V. Kolesnikov and E. Milman. Riemannian metrics on convex sets with applications to Poincaré and log-Sobolev inequalities. arxiv.org/abs/1510.02971, to appear in Calc. Var. & PDE, 2015.

[44] R. Latała and J. O. Wojtaszczyk. On the infimum convolution inequality. *Studia Math.*, 189(2):147–187, 2008.

[45] M. Ledoux. *The concentration of measure phenomenon*, volume 89 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[46] M. Ledoux. Spectral gap, logarithmic Sobolev constant, and geometric bounds. In *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. IX*, pages 219–240. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2004.

[47] V. G. Maz′ja. Classes of domains and imbedding theorems for function spaces. *Dokl. Acad. Nauk SSSR*, 3:527–530, 1960. Engl. transl. Soviet Math. Dokl., 1 (1961) 882–885.

[48] E. Milman. On the role of convexity in isoperimetry, spectral-gap and concentration. *Invent. Math.*, 177(1):1–43, 2009.

[49] E. Milman. Isoperimetric and concentration inequalities - equivalence under curvature lower bound. *Duke Math. J.*, 154(2):207–239, 2010.

[50] E. Milman. Isoperimetric bounds on convex manifolds. In C. Houdré, M. Ledoux, E. Milman, and M. Milman, editors, *Concentration, Functional Inequalities and Isoperimetry*, volume 545 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 195–208. Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.

[51] E. Milman. Properties of isoperimetric, functional and transport-entropy inequalities via concentration. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 152:475–507, 2012.
[52] E. Milman. Beyond traditional curvature-dimension I: new model spaces for isoperimetric and concentration inequalities in negative dimension. arxiv.org/abs/1409.4109, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 2014.
[53] V. D. Milman and A. Pajor. Isotropic position and interia ellipsoids and zonoids of the unit ball of a normed n-dimensional space. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis*, volume 1376 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 64–104. Springer-Verlag, 1987-1988.
[54] F. Morgan. *Geometric measure theory (a beginner's guide)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, fourth edition, 2009.
[55] V. V. Petrov. *Sums of independent random variables*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1975. Translated from the Russian by A. A. Brown, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 82.
[56] M. Pilipczuk and J. O. Wojtaszczyk. The negative association property for the absolute values of random variables equidistributed on a generalized Orlicz ball. *Positivity*, 12(3):421–474, 2008.
[57] M. Schmuckenschläger. Martingales, Poincaré type inequalities, and deviation inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 155(2):303–323, 1998.
[58] R. Schneider. *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, volume 44 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
[59] S. Sodin. An isoperimetric inequality on the ℓ_p balls. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 44(2):362–373, 2008.
[60] P. Sternberg and K. Zumbrun. On the connectivity of boundaries of sets minimizing perimeter subject to a volume constraint. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 7(1):199–220, 1999.
[61] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. With applications to statistics.
[62] C. Villani. *Optimal transport - old and new*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
[63] J. O. Wojtaszczyk. The square negative correlation property for generalized Orlicz balls. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, volume 1910 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 305–313. Springer, Berlin, 2007.